

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 28, 32-33, 36, 40-41, 44, 48-49 and 52-60 are pending. Claims 1-27 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claim 28 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 29 and 30; Claim 36 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 37 and 38; and Claim 44 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 45 and 46. New claims 52, 55 and 58 have been added and include the subject matter of unamended claim 28 and claim 31, unamended claim 36 and claim 39, and unamended claim 44 and claim 47, respectively. New claims 53-54, 56-57 and 59-60 correspond to claims 34-35, 42-43 and 50-51, respectively, rewritten for proper dependency purposes. Thus, claims 29-31, 34-35, 37-39, 42-43, 45-47 and 50-51 have been cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are fully supported by the specification and that no new matter has been added.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 28-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeh (US Patent No. 7,149, 911) further in view of Crouch et al. (US Patent No. 6,970,080). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As noted above, Applicant has amended Claim 28 to include the features of Claims 29 and 30. Thus, Claim 28 is now directed to a method that includes, among other things, sensing a level of power supplied to a processor in order to determine a current mode of operation and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the mode of operation of the processor. In his rejection of Claim 30, the Examiner contended that Yeh discloses the current mode of operation being determined by sensing a level of power supplied to the processor. The Examiner relied on column 3, lines 36-40. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mistaken. Column 3, lines 36-40 indicate that the parameters relied upon in Yeh include the type of power (AC or DC), the type of the desktop processor, and calculation modes of the

desktop processor. Thus, nowhere does Yeh disclose or even suggest sensing a level of power supplied to a processor in order to determine a current mode of operation. Instead, Yeh discloses using the above parameters in order to obtain an operational voltage and operational frequency required by the desktop processor from transformation tables 221.

It is respectfully submitted that Crouch et al. does not make up for the lack of teaching in Yeh. Crouch et al. is directed to a computer shutdown system that includes a sitting detection assembly that is mounted in a seat cushion. A transmitter sends a wireless signal when the pressure indicator detects weight. A receiver receives the wireless signal and is electrically coupled to a computer processor. The computer processor may selectively power down or power up the computer system upon reception of the wireless signal sent by the transmitter. Thus, Crouch et al. does not disclose or even suggest sensing a level of power supplied to the processor in order to determine a current mode of operation and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the mode of operation of the processor. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, teach, disclose or even suggest a method as recited in Claim 28. Therefore, Claim 28 is allowable.

Claims 32 and 33 depend on Claim 28 and therefore, they are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 28 is allowable.

Claim 36 is directed to an apparatus that comprises, among other things, a power measure controller configured to sense a level of power supplied to a processor in order to determine a current mode of operation and to modify the operating voltage based on the mode of operation of the processor. As discussed above, neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, teach, disclose or even suggest such an apparatus. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 36 is allowable. Claims 40 and 41 depend on Claim 36 and therefore they are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 36 is allowable.

Claim 44 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium and a set of instructions stored in the storage medium, which when executed by a

power management controller cause the power management controller to perform operations comprising, among other things, sensing a level of power supplied to the processor in order to determine a mode of operation and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the mode of operation of the processor. As discussed above, neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, disclose or even suggest such an article of manufacture. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 44 is allowable. Claims 48 and 49 depend on Claim 44 and therefore, they are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 44 is allowable.

As noted above, Claim 52 incorporates the features of Claims 28 and 31. Thus, Claim 52 is directed to a method comprising, among other things, receiving a signal indicating an anticipated mode of operation of the processor and modifying the operating voltage provided to a processor based on the signal. In his rejection of Claim 31, the Examiner contends that Yeh discloses receiving a signal (control signals) indicating an anticipated mode of operation of the processor, wherein the operating voltage is modified based on the signal (see column 3, line 29 and lines 36-40). Once again, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mistaken.

The control signal relied upon by Examiner is just that, a control signal. Nowhere in Yeh is it disclosed that the control signal indicates “an anticipated mode of operation of the processor.” In column 3, lines 29-33, Yeh simply states “based on a control signal from the power management controller 23 and a judge signal from the desktop type processor 21, the clock generator 21 outputs a clock signal to determine an operational frequency and voltage of the desktop type processor 21.” Likewise, lines 36-40 of column 3 have already been discussed above and they too do not disclose any type of signal indicating an anticipated mode of operation of a processor. That section of Yeh simply indicates parameters used in order to obtain an operational voltage and an operational frequency required by the desktop processor from transformation tables. Thus, it is clear from that section that Yeh discloses a method based upon using or working with a current mode of operation for the processor. At column 3, lines 61-65, Yeh discloses “furthermore, after the portable computer 100 is turned on, if the calculation mode of the desktop type processor 21 changes, such as from normal mode

to power saving mode, or from the over clock mode to power saving mode, the clock generator 22 can be informed by a proper software.” Thus, once again Yeh discloses a method based upon using or working with a current mode of operation, i.e., when the calculation mode of the desktop type processor actually “changes” as opposed to an anticipated mode of operation as recited in Claim 52.

As discussed above, Crouch et al. does not make up for the lack of teaching in Yeh. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, disclose or even suggest a method as recited in Claim 52 and therefore, Claim 52 is allowable.

Claim 55 is directed to an apparatus comprising, among other things, a power management controller that is adapted to receive a signal indicating an anticipated mode of operation of a processor and to modify the operating voltage based on the signal. As discussed above, neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, disclose or even suggest such an apparatus. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 55 is allowable. Claims 56 and 57 depend on Claim 55 and therefore, they are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 55 is allowable.

Claim 58 is directed to an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium and a set of instructions stored in the storage medium, which when executed by a power management controller cause the power management controller to perform operations comprising, among other things, receiving a signal indicating an anticipated mode of operation of the processor and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the signal. As discussed above, neither Yeh nor Crouch et al., either alone or in combination, disclosed or even suggest such an article of manufacture and therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 58 is allowable. Claims 59 and 60 depend on Claim 58 and therefore, they are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 58 is allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 28, 32-33, 36, 40-41, 44, 48-49 and 52-60 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Thus, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Please contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2997 regarding any questions or concerns associated with the present matter. If any fees are due in connection with this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 06/04/2007

/Kevin T. LeMond/

Kevin T. LeMond
Reg. No. 35,933

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981